



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the fact that the defendant's name appeared thereon does not affect the case. *Foster v. Wadsworth-Howland Co.* (1897) 168 Ill. 514, 48 N. E. 163. It is also clear that he was to bear the risk of profit and loss as he was bound to deliver the defendant's goods at a stipulated sum per week, regardless of the cost. It would seem, therefore, that delivering the goods was the undertaking of McGuire rather than that of the defendant. *Wood v. Cobb* (1866) 95 Mass. 58. Even though the control of the work as to its result rested with the defendant, this fact alone would not make McGuire a servant. *Hawke v. Brown* (1898) 28 App. Div. 37, 50 N. Y. Supp. 1032; *Gall v. Detroit Journal Co.* (1916) 191 Mich. 405, 15 N. W. 36; *McGee v. Stockton* (1916) 62 Ind. App. 555, 113 N. E. 388. According to many decisions it would seem that McGuire was an independent contractor. Cf. *Burns v. Michigan Paint Co.* (1908) 152 Mich. 613, 116 N. W. 182; *Cohen v. Western Electric Co.* (1906) 50 Misc. 660, 99 N. Y. Supp. 525; *Jahn's Adm'r. v. Wm. H. McKnight & Co.* (1904) 117 Ky. 655, 78 S. W. 862; *Foster v. Wadsworth-Howland Co.*, *supra*.

NEGLIGENCE—PROXIMATE CAUSE—INCONSISTENT FINDINGS OF FACT.—The defendant leased certain premises to the plaintiff's employer, covenanting to furnish heat. The defendant failed to heat the premises as agreed, in spite of repeated complaints by the plaintiff. The plaintiff became afflicted with tuberculosis. The jury found (1) that the defendant's failure to perform his covenant constituted actionable negligence and was the proximate cause of the plaintiff's injury, and (2) that the plaintiff was not contributorily negligent. The trial judge allowed a verdict based on these findings to stand as against a motion for a new trial. *Hansman v. Western Union Telegraph Co.* (Minn. 1919) 174 N. W. 434.

The jury, by finding that the defendant's wrongful act was the proximate cause of the plaintiff's injury, found that the plaintiff's injury was the natural and direct result of the defendant's failure to furnish heat,—that the consequences were such as an ordinarily prudent man might have anticipated under the circumstances. *Kommerstad v. Great Northern Ry.* (1913) 120 Minn. 376, 139 N. W. 713; *Wallin v. Eastern Ry.* (1901) 83 Minn. 149, 86 N. W. 76; *Burnham v. Boston & Maine R. R.* (1917) 227 Mass. 422, 116 N. E. 735. The plaintiff's reiterated complaints to the defendant fairly indicate that she not only realized that the building was not being properly heated but also knew in some way, just how is unimportant, that the defendant was the party upon whom the duty to heat rested. Having this knowledge, the plaintiff, as an ordinarily reasonable person, would be charged with notice of the results which might naturally flow from the defendant's conduct, *Borden v. Daisy Roller-Mill Co.* (1898) 98 Wis. 407, 74 N. W. 91; *Soutar v. Minneapolis I. E. Co.* (1897) 68 Minn. 18, 70 N. W. 796, and therefore by continuing to work on the premises, must be held to have assumed the risk of those consequences or else to have been contributorily negligent. *Borden v. Daisy Roller-Mill Co.*, *supra*. The findings (1) that the defendant's act constituted actionable negligence and was the proximate cause of the plaintiff's injury, and (2) that the plaintiff was not contributorily negligent, were inconsistent and the court should not have allowed the verdict to stand.

QUASI-CONTRACTS—SALES—ACCEPTANCE OF EXCESS QUANTITY OF GOODS BY MISTAKE.—The plaintiff contracted to buy and the defendant to